

448/08, dated 21st December 1932, to one cent as mentioned in Cochin Government Gazette, dated 14th Edavam 1108, Part I, page 1035, where the notification No. 363, dated 7th Edavam for acquisition is published;

(2) has not the said Thanda put in petitions objecting to the increase in extent;

(2) have any enquiries been made or orders passed; if so, what?

Mr. U. Kandir Menon.—(1) The extent in the Gazette notification dated 7th Edavam 1108, is the correct one, got after proper computation of the area by the Land Record Office as per the alignment fixed by the Public Health Department. The extent noted in the order is only approximate.

(2) Yes.

(3) No enquiries were necessary as the increase in extent was only due to correct computation of area.

Kurumbilavu river—taking new course.

346. Mr. C. A. Ouseph.—Is the Government aware that the advent of the new canal has aided the river to wash and eat away large portion of land in Kurumbilavu and that a new course for the river is gradually being shaped through lands owned by the Kalarikkal family in Kurumbilavu?

Mr. V. K. Aravindaksha Menon.—Government have not constructed a new canal in Kurumbilavu. The old Chirakkal thodu was widened during the last two years. Government have no information regarding the encroachment of the river on lands owned by the Kalarikkal family.

Gold flag staff—newspaper article on—action regarding.

347. Mr. K. M. Ibrahim.—Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) whether they have noted the article “ഭഗവതൻ പെരുന്നം കോട് മരം” in the Sahodaran of Mithunam 24, 1108;

(b) what their respective position is regarding the points raised therein;

(c) what action they have taken thereon;

(d) what more action they intend to take in the matter?

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—(a) Yes.

(b), (c) and (d) Since the work is one relating to Devaswam, Government regret that they cannot answer the question.

Mr. K. M. Ibrahim.—May I know Sir, why this question was admitted at all if it is a matter concerning the Devaswam Department?